

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IO



WASHINGTON OPERATIONS OFFICE
c/o WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, PV-11
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504

August 2, 1989

REPLY TO
ATTN OF:

WOO

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Centralia and Pasco Landfills

FROM: Bob Kievit *B.K.*
Washington Operations Office

TO: Bill Schmidt, Acting Branch Chief
Superfund Branch

The Centralia and Pasco Sanitary Landfills were proposed for the NPL in June 1988. Final decisions on listing these sites on the NPL are expected sometime prior to early 1990. The March 18, 1988, agreement between EPA and the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) gave the lead role for these two sites to Ecology. RI/FS activities have not begun at either site. Recent discussions with Ecology have revealed that they have no immediate plans (during state FY 90) to begin negotiations with PRPs for RI/FS starts at these two sites due to lack of funding and the priority of these sites relative to others that they are working on. However, Ecology and the City of Centralia are negotiating a plan for closure of the Centralia Landfill. I have been told that this will be an estimated \$8-million project with significant state funding but that the NPL listing is clouding up the negotiations. I will be learning more about the City's and Ecology's plan for the Landfill when I meet with them on August 21.

As these two sites are proposed NPL sites, EPA has a responsibility to insure that RI/FS activities begin on some reasonable timeframe. I have indicated to Ecology that if they want to retain the lead role at these sites, EPA will need to see some RI/FS activity begin. However, since these sites are not on the SCAP, this is a rather idle "threat". With this in mind, I request that you consider these two sites during preparation for the upcoming SCAP negotiations.

Here are four alternatives for dealing with these two NPL sites for your consideration:

1. If we are successful in placing either of these sites on the FY 90 SCAP, we can take the lead role back from Ecology and begin PRP negotiations.

PASSF
1.1.1V
8/2/89

USEPA SF



1371117

2. If we are successful in placing either of these two sites on the FY 90 SCAP as alternatives, we can better utilize the "threat" to take back the lead agency role from Ecology.
3. We can offer CERCLA enforcement funding to Ecology as an inducement for them to begin PRP negotiations for RI/FS activities as soon as the funding gets to Ecology. This funding will be seed money to allow Ecology to prepare for and complete negotiations for an RI/FS. After a consent decree is signed, Ecology will be expected to have their oversight costs provided for by the PRPs.
4. Do nothing and hope that Ecology will begin work on the sites in their next fiscal year (after July 1, 1990).

I think EPA interests will best be served by alternative #3, followed by alternative #1. I would like to discuss these two sites and the ideas expressed in this memo when convenient for you.